



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,248	07/29/2003	Stephen Mark Mueller	P23666	5445
7055 7590 08/22/2008 GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191				
EXAMINER BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R				
ART UNIT 2146		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 08/22/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/628,248

Applicant(s)

MUELLER ET AL.

Examiner

BENJAMIN R. BRUCKART

Art Unit

2146

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9 and 13-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9 and 13-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

Detailed Action

Claims 1-7, 9, 13-24 are pending in this Office Action.

Claims 8, 10-12 are cancelled.

Claims 22-24 are new.

Claims 1, 13-14, 16 are amended.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed in the amendment filed 7/9/08, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The reasons are set forth below.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-7, 9; 10-12; and 13-15 are directed to statutory subject matter as a machine that is embodied between client devices and server devices.

Claims 16-21 are directed to the statutory category of a process in which the steps of the invention are performed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 22; 13-14, 23; 16-17, 20-21, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0028621 by Furlong et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication 20040083291 by Pessi et al.

Regarding claim 1, the Furlong reference teaches:

a system for providing a presence component in a telecommunications network in which a session to a session terminator is requested by a session initiator upon receiving an instruction from a user (Furlong: page 1, para 7 teaches presence information; page 8, para 94-96 shows third party users wanting to send messages to a subscriber), the system, comprising;

a presence server configured to receive a request for presence information from a requestor (Furlong: page 2, para 20; the PLAS; request for information para 21), which is configured to receive a session request from the session initiator and to generate the request for presence information (Furlong: page 2, para 24); processing the request by comparing the session initiator's identity to preferences of the session terminator and sending a preferred treatment to the requestor (Furlong: page 2, para 24; recipient identity; page 3, para 30); and

wherein the session is initiated or rejected based upon a preferred treatment dictated by the preferences of the session terminator (Furlong: page 3, para 30-32), which include one preference selected from the group consisting of accepting the session request, rejecting the session request or directing the session initiator to a message storage system (Furlong: page 3, para 31-32);

wherein control and privacy of the session is given to the session terminator (Furlong: page 2, para 24; page 3, para 30-32),

The Furlong reference does not teach an intermediate between the presence server and user as claimed as the requestor.

The Pessi reference teaches a requestor (Pessi: Fig. 3, tag 308) that lies between devices and the presence server for intercepting adapting and relaying messages from the presence server (Pessi: page 5, para 47) and service logic for requesting session parameters from the session initiator (Pessi: page 5-6, para 51-52).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the invention as taught by Furlong to include the requestor and session parameters as taught by Pessi in order to intercept, adapt, and relay messages from the presence server (Pessi: page 5, para 47).

Regarding claim 2, the system of claim 1, further comprising:

a collector configured to collect information from the session initiator (Furlong: page 2, para 23; logging, tracking and accounting; or page 4, para 44).

Regarding claim 3, the system of claim 2, in which the session initiator further comprises a user agent client that forwards the request to the requestor (Furlong: page 8, para 96; wife sends request to the PLAS), and a call user agent client that initiates the session (Furlong: page 8, para 96; message is delivered).

Regarding claim 6, the system of claim 2, in which the requestor is further configured to request additional information about the session request and process the session request based upon the additional information (Furlong: page 8, para 93).

Regarding claim 4, the system of claim 1, in which the session initiator further comprises a call user agent client that initiates the session and a trigger generator that generates a trigger message (Furlong: page 8, para 93).

Regarding claim 9, the system of claim 1, further comprising:

a session controller configured to control initiation of the session (Furlong: page 2, para 23-24).

Regarding claim 22, the system of claim 1, wherein the session can be initiated solely on a presence identity of the session terminator (Furlong: page 8, para 94; initiating the session based if the subscriber is present and available, if so, then sending the message).

Regarding claim 13, the Furlong reference teaches:

a system for providing a presence component in a wireless telecommunications network in which a session is requested by a mobile device (Furlong: page 1, para 7 teaches presence information; page 8, para 94-96 shows third party users wanting to send messages to a subscriber), the system comprising:

a presence server configured to receive the request for presence information (Furlong: page 2, para 20; the PLAS; request for information para 21) and to process the request by comparing the mobile device's identity to preferences of a session terminator and sending session set up information to the requestor to set up the session (Furlong: page 2, para 24),

wherein the session is initiated or rejected based upon the session set up information (Furlong: page 8, para 94-95) dictated by the preferences of the session terminator (Furlong: page 3, para 30-32), which include one preference selected from the group consisting of accepting the session request, rejecting the session request or directing the session initiator to a message storage system (Furlong: page 3, para 31-32);

wherein control and privacy of the session is given to the session terminator (Furlong: page 2, para 24; page 3, para 30-32).

The Furlong reference does not teach an intermediate between the presence server and user as claimed as the requestor.

The Pessi reference teaches a requestor (Pessi: Fig. 3, tag 308) that lies between devices and the presence server for intercepting adapting and relaying messages from the presence server (Pessi: page 5, para 47) and service logic for requesting session parameters from the session initiator (Pessi: page 5-6, para 51-52).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the invention as taught by Furlong to include the requestor and session parameters as taught by Pessi in order to intercept, adapt, and relay messages from the presence server (Pessi: page 5, para 47).

Regarding claim 14, the system of claim 13, wherein the requestor resides in the wireless network, the requestor forwarding the session request, including the preferred session parameters to the presence server (Pessi: pages 4-5, para 45).

Regarding claim 23, the system of claim 13, wherein the session can be initiated solely on a presence identity of the session terminator (Furlong: page 8, para 94; initiating the session based if the subscriber is present and available, if so, then sending the message).

Regarding claim 16, the Furlong reference teaches:

a method for incorporating presence into a telecommunications environment (Furlong: page 1, para 7 teaches presence information; page 2, para 19-20), the method comprising:
receiving a session request from a session initiator in response to a user instruction (Furlong: page 2, para 20; the PLAS; request for information para 21; page 8, para 96);
generating a request for presence information in response to the received session request (Furlong: page 2, para 20; page 8, para 96);
sending the request for presence information to a presence platform to obtain presence information for another telecommunications user (Furlong: page 2, para 20; the PLAS; request for information para 21);
receiving preferred treatment information from the presence platform (Furlong: page 8, para 94-95); and
initiating or rejecting a telecommunications session with the other telecommunications user in response to the obtained presence information and the preferred treatment information (Furlong: page 3, para 30-32) dictated by the preferences of the session terminator, which include one preference selected from the group consisting of accepting the session request, rejecting the session request or directing the session initiator to a message storage system (Furlong: page 3, para 31-32);
wherein control and privacy of the session is given to the session terminator (Furlong: page 2, para 24; page 3, para 30-32).

The Furlong reference does not teach an intermediate between the presence server and user as claimed as the presence platform.

The Pessi reference teaches a presence platform (Pessi: Fig. 3, tag 308) that lies between devices and the presence server for intercepting adapting and relaying messages from the presence server (Pessi: page 5, para 47) and preferred session parameters (Pessi: page 5-6, para 51-52).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the invention as taught by Furlong to include the requestor and session parameters as taught by Pessi in order to intercept, adapt, and relay messages from the presence server (Pessi: page 5, para 47).

Regarding claim 17, the method of claim 16, further comprising:

forwarding preferred session parameters to the presence platform (Furlong: page 8, para 93-95); and

determining the presence information based on the preferred session parameters (Furlong: page 8, para 93-95).

Regarding claim 20, the method of claim 16, in which the preferred session parameters comprise at least one of session type, urgency, and subject (Furlong: page 8, para 93 where the event is a type or Page 8, para 96 wherein the grouping of users is a type of session).

Regarding claim 21, the method of claim 16, further comprising:

requesting additional information about the session request (Furlong: page 8, para 93);
and

processing the session request based upon the additional information (Furlong: page 8, para 93).

Regarding claim 24, the method of claim 16, wherein the session can be initiated solely on a presence identity of the other telecommunications user (Furlong: page 8, para 94; initiating the session based if the subscriber is present and available, if so, then sending the message).

Claims 5, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0028621 by Furlong et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication 20040083291 by Pessi et al in further view of U.S. Patent No. 20040131042 by Lillie et al.

Regarding claim 5, the modified Furlong reference teaches the system of claim 4. The modified Furlong reference fails to state an INVITE message.

However, the Lillie reference teaches a session initiator initiates the session by sending an INVITE message to the session terminator based upon the preferred treatment (Lillie: page 1, para 9; page 3, para 34) in order to establish a connection between two endpoints in a session (Lillie: page 1, para 9).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system as taught by modified Furlong to include INVITE messages as taught by Lillie in order to establish a connection between two endpoints in a session (Lillie: page 1, para 9).

Regarding claim 7, the modified Furlong reference teaches the system of claim 1. The modified Furlong reference fails to state an INVITE message.

However, the Lillie reference teaches a session initiation protocol (SIP) proxy server including service logic that receives the session request from the session initiator (Lillie: page 4, para 42), wherein the SIP proxy server initiates the session by sending an INVITE message to the session terminator based upon the preferred treatment (Lillie: page 4, para 42) in order to establish a connection between two endpoints in a session (Lillie: page 1, para 9).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system as taught by modified Furlong to include INVITE messages as taught by Lillie in order to establish a connection between two endpoints in a session (Lillie: page 1, para 9).

Claims 15, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0028621 by Furlong et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication 20040083291 by Pessi et al in further view of U.S. Patent No. 20040203644 by Lei et al.

Regarding claim 15, the modified Furlong reference teaches the system of claim 14, in which the mobile device comprises:

a user agent client receiving the session setup information from the requestor (Pessi: page 5, para 45-46); and

a call user agent client that initiates the session based on the session set up information, which is received from the user agent client (Pessi: page 5, para 49).

The modified Furlong reference fails to state prompting the user for information.

However, the Lei a user agent client that forwards the session request to the requestor and prompts a user to enter the preferred session parameters (Lei: page 4, para 45-47),

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system as taught by modified Furlong to include a prompting a user as taught by Lei in order to let a user decide whether it wants to establish a accept or reject a session request (Lei: page 4, para 47).

Regarding claim 19, the modified Furlong reference teaches the method of claim 16 and obtained presence information indicates that the session terminator is unavailable or busy (Pessi: page 5, para 49).

The modified Furlong reference fails to state notifying the initiator the session was rejection.

The Lei reference teaches the initiating further comprises not initiating the session and informing the session initiator that the session request was rejected (Lei: page 4, para 47) in order to let the caller establish a one-way session and leave a message or terminate the session (Lei: page 4, para 47).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system as taught by modified Furlong to include a notifying a rejected call as taught

by Lei in order to let the caller establish a one way session and leave a message or terminate the session (Lei: page 4, para 47).

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0028621 by Furlong et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication 20040083291 by Pessi et al in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7123707 by Hiri et al.

Regarding claim 18, the modified Furlong reference teaches the method of claim 16. The modified Furlong reference fails to teach voicemail.

However, the Hiri reference teaches obtained presence information comprises instructions to forward to voice mail (Hiri: col. 3, lines 30-60), and

in which the initiating further comprises connecting to the voice mail (Hiri: col. 7, lines 47- col. 8, line 3) in order to communicate without interrupting a previous session (Hiri: col. 1, lines 45-57).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system as taught by modified Furlong to include voicemail as taught by Hiri in order to let the caller leave a message if a session isn't established and not interrupt current sessions (Hiri: col. 1, lines 45-57).

Remarks

Applicant has made amendments to the claims and has argued the newly amended claim limitations.

The Applicant Argues:

The Furlong reference in view of Pessi reference do not teach "session initiator is able to communicate preferred session parameters."

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The Furlong reference in view of Pessi reference do teach the limitations as claimed, therefore the rejection is maintained.

Pessi teaches 'service logic' for requesting from the initiator 'session parameters' in Pessi: pages 5-6, para 51-52. Pessi teaches requesting the CPI from the session initiator in order

to determine how to handle the content in the session. Using the parameters of both the session devices, the proxy will handle the content and session differently through different ways of adaptation of content or content indirection. This interpretation reads on the generic term 'session parameters' because the parameters dictate how data is handled in the session.

The limitations of initiating or rejecting a session in response to obtained presence information is taught by Furlong on page 3, para 30-32 where a subscriber can allow or deny access through preferences and availability rules and preferences. The rules and preferences are established by the subscriber, interpreted as the terminator, which allow them control over their privacy of the session.

With respect to the new limitations, Furlong teaches a session can be initiated solely on a presence identity of the session terminator (Furlong: page 8, para 94). The session is created and message delivered based on the presence of the terminator.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R. Bruckart whose telephone number is (571) 272-3982. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Pwu can be reached on (571) 272-6798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2146

/Benjamin R Bruckart/
Examiner, Art Unit 2146

/Jeffrey Pwu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2146